

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). Before the next speaker begins, the Chair wishes to apologize for having misread its list of speakers. The Chair will attempt to be as fair as possible and rotate between the majority and the minority, but the Chair apologizes for the mix-up.

TRIBUTE TO HERB KENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise tonight to pay tribute to a great Chicagoan, a personal friend, and a good friend to many, Chicago radio personality Herbert Rogers Kent—"the Cool Gent"—on the occasion of his induction into the Radio Hall of Fame and on the celebration of his 50 years of dedicated entertainment and service to Chicago and the surrounding communities.

Herb's many innovative and outstanding accomplishments include the development of varied fictional radio characters such as "The Waahoo Man," "the Grunchuns," "the Gym Shoe Creeper," "Rodney Roach," "the Electric Crazy People," "the ever cunning, Cadillac-driving Rudolph," and many others. Herb is also credited with coining the phrase "Dusty Records".

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, Herb was a fixture at virtually every high school hop in the city of Chicago. The popularity of these hops extended to colleges and universities throughout the State of Illinois. While at radio station WVON, Herb broadcast live from a different high school each Friday night. The records he played would race to the top of the charts.

The Cool Gent's talents extend far beyond spinning LP's at clubs and radio stations. With his own unique flair, Herb has demonstrated a genuine commitment to his community by orchestrating a number of successful public service campaigns. Among these was the "Stay in School Campaign." For 15 minutes each day in the 1960's, Herb would speak directly to his young listeners. "If you don't stay in school," he told them, "you're cutting your own throat." When Dr. Martin Luther King made what was to be his last appearance in Chicago, Herb Kent joined Stevie Wonder the master of ceremony at the event in Soldier's Field.

Herb Kent "The Cool Gent" holds a special place in the small circle of this country's radio luminaries that include Wolfman Jack, Dick Clark, and Casey Kasem.

Herb's latest honor follows a career filled with recognition for his good work from such esteemed organizations as the Chicago Urban League and the Midwest Radio Association.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Herb Kent for sharing his gift with all

of us. I am pleased to enter these words of tribute and congratulations into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI] is recognized for 2 minutes.

AN UNNECESSARY SHUTDOWN OF
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BALDACCI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today is the fourth day that the Federal Government of the United States has been shut down because this Congress has failed to complete its work in a timely manner. Our national economy is suffering as a result, the dollar is down against every other national currency and nearly 3.5 million Americans have been adversely affected by our failure to act. That does not include the number of Federal employees who have been furloughed or asked to work without knowing when they will be paid next.

I have introduced a resolution to require the House to work this coming Sunday instead of taking a vacation day. We should stay here in session, and we should be doing our voting, and a clean continuing resolution passed so that the American people do not have to start another work week with the Federal Government closed.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BALDACCI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Just one question, Mr. Speaker. I would like to inquire of my friend, the gentleman from Maine, is it not true that the President could end this right now with a stroke of his pen on the continuing resolutions that have been sent, instead of vetoing those resolutions?

Mr. BALDACCI. I think the President does not have the second continuing resolution, but my understanding is that the resolution that has been set forth is still in the Senate. That is my understanding.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is it not also true that this Government would still be in operation had the President not wielded the veto pen earlier this week?

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I believe it was that the President constitutionally has the authority to veto measures. That is his constitutional provision. To hold the President hostage unless he accepts your scheme in order to balance the budget and provide large tax breaks, is to hold the President hostage and the rest of the Government hostage to the scheme that you are trying to put forth on this country.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I can assure the

gentleman personally there is no scheme. We are simply trying to balance the budget for our children and for future generations and to assure Medicare and prosperity for seniors.

Mr. BALDACCI. I would just like to ask a question. Is there a \$245 billion tax break over 7 years in your budget, your 7-year budget?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Yes, for children primarily for a \$500 tax break per child.

Mr. BALDACCI. It is not just children.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would also point out it goes to 80 percent of the American people, not to the wealthy.

FACTS AND NUMBERS OF THE
REPUBLICAN BUDGET BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing this argument about huge tax cuts, huge tax breaks to super-rich people at the expenses of the poor. I would like to present to you, I would like to give this chart to the people in California. They all know me. I was an engineer prior to becoming a Congressman. I know how to deal with the facts and numbers, because numbers do not lie. You will be shocked to find out what I am about to say tonight.

Let us take a look at this. Rich people are not paying their share. Let us take a look at this. The top 50 percent of income earners of the American people have paid more than 95 percent of the entire national income tax. The bottom 50 percent only pay 4.8 percent, hardly anything.

Look at the share of income. The income share is only 85 percent, but their tax burden is much higher. Here, it is the exact opposite. The bottom 50 percent do not pay any tax at all, practically, no taxes. Only the top 50 percent are paying taxes. Do not tell me that people are not paying their fair share.

Who is rich? Here it is. Here are people that are all rich. In the definition of our liberal friends, rich is anybody who makes more than \$21,000 a year, is considered rich. Anybody who has a job is considered rich. Is this shocking to you?

Let me go to the next one. Let us take a look at what happened in the last 10 years. Back 10 years ago, the top 50 percent, they only paid that much. Look at what happens now. Their tax share has gone up every year for the last 10 years. Look at the bottom 50 percent. Their tax share has actually declined.

In other words, these folks are paying less and less taxes each year, and the top 50 percent are paying more and more tax each year. If this trend continues, then what is going to happen? Right now it is almost a 2 to 1 ratio.

Let us take a look at these folks down here. These people have truly needed some help. I understand that.

But I cannot believe that half of the population of this country really need some help. I cannot believe that half of the population in this country really need some government help. It is hard for me to believe.

Who are these folks up here? They are the ones having children, trying to send their kids to school, support their families, having a little house and condominium, plus they have to pay for all this national defense, 2½ million fellow employees, all this, plus they have to support one more family down here. You have to support your family plus one more family down here. Do you think that is fair?

Mr. Speaker, right now it is almost a 1 point ratio, and the bottom is growing, growing, each year. Now, let us take a look at this. They are talking about a huge tax credit. What is it? A \$500 tax credit per child. That is what we are talking about, a huge tax credit to the super rich. Let me tell you who they are. The \$500 tax credit stops at incomes of \$75,000. If you make more than \$75,000 a year, you do not even get a \$500 tax credit for your child. Your child is not worth \$500. The only folks who get the \$500 credit will be right here, these folks.

Our liberal friends are screaming it is unfair, it is a huge tax credit to the rich people, because they are forgetting what is a tax credit. A tax credit means you have to pay a tax to get a credit. These people do not pay any taxes. Therefore, we cannot give them a tax credit. Do you think we should pay them \$500 in cash instead?

Second, as I mentioned earlier, the super rich. If you make \$75,000 a year you are super rich. I have been hearing this time after time, that we give a huge tax break to those folks who do not need the money. You mean they do not need the money? Why are we doing this \$500 tax credit? Because by doing it, by doing this, it can save money; by doing this, the billionaires can borrow money, create more jobs, so these folks can go up. That is the idea of the \$500 credit.

We cannot go on with this. The last 30 years, it does not work. We have to create more jobs to help these folks, so these people can go up to being the tax-paying group, instead of the tax-consuming group.

AN INJUSTICE CENTERED ON SILENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DOGGETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, we can have a legitimate dispute over matters such as that which we just heard, knowing a different perspective on some of these issues, knowing that the whole idea of middle class to at least one of our Republican colleagues was that those who earned even as much as \$183,000 were lower middle class, but there are some issues that ought to go

beyond partisanship. They ought to go beyond differences in philosophy. I think we have seen one of those issues presented in this House tonight.

Of the many injustices that have occurred on the floor of this House this year, none, certainly, is any greater than what which we saw tonight. I refer to an injustice not based on what was said here on the floor of this House, but on what was not said.

Usually when people on one side or the other complain about an injustice, they are talking about a vote that was taken and many speeches and debate, as we have had here today. But this was the muzzling of debate. This was the gagging of debate. This was an injustice that centered on silence, not on anything that was said. This injustice related to the handling of a privileged resolution that was presented here on the floor of the House tonight, presented by the gentleman from Florida, Mr. HARRY JOHNSTON and Mr. PETERSON. It concerned a very important matter, that being the ethical standards that prevail in this House or do not prevail in this House.

The timing of the consideration of this resolution was interesting, at the end of a long day of debate. The timing of this resolution seemed to be designed, along with the motion to table that immediately cut off consideration of this measure, immediately cut it off without any presentation of the kind of debate that we are seeing here tonight on matters concerning the budget, and yet, which go to the core of the operation of this Congress; that is, the confidence of the American people in the integrity of this body.

Let me just read to you, since it was done so hurriedly, and without any opportunity for debate, from this resolution:

"Whereas the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is currently considering several ethics complaints against Speaker NEWT GINGRICH"—and indeed, they are, there have been a number of such complaints—"and whereas the committee has traditionally handled such cases by appointing an independent nonpartisan outside counsel," a procedure which has been adopted in every major ethics case since the committee was established, and, indeed, that is also accurate; in fact, on at least nine occasions, including Speaker Jim Wright, an independent counsel was appointed—"and whereas, although complaints against Speaker GINGRICH have been under consideration for more than 14 months," for 14 months, for every day of this great revolutionary new Congress those complaints have been pending and nothing has happened, "this committee has failed to appoint an outside counsel, and whereas the committee has also deviated from other longstanding precedents and rules of procedure, including its failure to adopt a resolution of preliminary inquiry before calling third-party witnesses and receiving sworn testimony,"—and in the section

of the resolution, of course, referring to the rules of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct which, based on the news reports, have not been complied with.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the gentleman would yield for a moment.

Mr. DOGGETT. For a question, certainly.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that each one of these complaints that has been brought against the Speaker of the House has been brought by a Member of the opposite party, the Democratic Party, the minority party?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is correct that we have yet had an opportunity to discuss these complaints, and, yes, they have. And the whole thrust of this resolution is to have someone who is neither Democrat nor Republican participate in an independent consideration of those complaints to find out if they have been partisan or nonpartisan. And, as the resolution so indicates, whereas these procedural irregularities and the unusual delay in the appointment of an independent outside counsel have led to widespread concern that the committee is making special exceptions for the Speaker of the House; and, whereas the integrity of the House depends on the confidence of the American people, and the fairness and impartiality of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct; therefore, be it resolved that the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct should report to the House no later than November 28, 1995, concerning first, the status of the committee's investigation of the complaints against Speaker GINGRICH; the committee's disposition with regard to the appointment of a nonpartisan outside counsel and the scope of the counsel's investigation; and, finally, a timetable for committee action on the complaints.

That is to say, that the resolution did not go so far as to actually demand the immediate appointment of an outside counsel, but only that the committee come forward and report on what it has been doing throughout this year. Yet, Mr. Speaker, every Republican who voted refused to have even an investigation reported to this House on this critical ethical matter.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARR). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, is it not the longstanding tradition and, in fact, the rules of the House that no Member is to discuss the workings of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct? Are these not rules that were adopted under previous Democratic Congresses, and it is not legitimate for Members to discuss the internal workings of the Committee on Standards of